



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,090	12/09/2003	Jea-Woo Park	1572.1255	2809
21171	7590	10/21/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			BROUSSARD, COREY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,090

Applicant(s)

PARK, JEA-WOO

Examiner

Corey M. Broussard

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/09/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the non-tubular shaped jacks as required by claim 7 must be shown or the features canceled from the claim. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Figure 4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the first grounding jack is referring to. The term lacks proper antecedent basis and is also confusing in that there is only one grounding jack in the specification and figures. The grounding jack being the same size as itself is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long et al. in view of Martucci. With respect to claim 1, Long teaches a computer main body (102) and a docking station (400 may be a docking tray according to page 5 paragraph 52 line 4). The computer main body and docking station each have a connection port to receive electrical power (126' and 422 respectively). Long also teaches of an AC/DC adapter main body (200) with a DC power cable (230) and a power supplying jack (224') at an end. Long does not disclose a second cable branched off from the power supply cable with a jack at one end. Martucci teaches of a power supply cable (1) with a grounding cable (4) branched off and ending in a grounding jack (19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the AC/DC adapter and connection jacks of Long with the auxiliary grounding wire of Martucci to obtain an AC/DC adapter capable of electrically connecting to both the computer and docking station where one device would receive electrical power and both would be directly connected to the ground plane of the AC/DC adapter.

6. With respect to claim 2, for the purpose of applying art it is assumed that the grounding jack is to be the same size as the power supply jack. With respect to the grounding jack, Long as modified by Martucci fails to disclose the grounding jack having the same cross section and size as the power supply jack with first grounding terminal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a separate grounding jack as taught by Martucci of any known size and shape that is known for use with plugs. The rationale that a particular shape is a design choice may be found in legal

precedent: *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) (The court held that the configuration of the claimed disposable plastic nursing container was a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed container was significant.)

7. With respect to claim 3, Long teaches an AC/DC power supply adapter base (200) with a power cable (230) terminating at a power supplying jack (224'). Long does not disclose a second cable connected to the power cable. Martucci teaches of a power cable (1) with a grounding cable (4) connected to the power cable and terminating at the other end in a grounding jack (19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the AC/DC adapter of Long with the auxiliary grounding wire of Martucci to obtain an AC/DC adapter capable of connecting a portable device (400) and the interfacing docking station (100) where one would receive power through the power supplying jack and the other would be connected through the grounding jack to supply an alternative ground path.

8. With respect to claim 4, Long as modified by Martucci teaches of a power supplying jack (224') with a terminal (212') for supplying DC power and a tubular grounding conductor (214') coaxial with the terminal (Fig. 9).

9. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Long as modified by Martucci fails to disclose the grounding jack having a tubular grounding conductor and the same dimensions as power supplying jack. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a power and grounding jack as taught by Long modified by Martucci in any

known size and shape that is known for use with plugs. The rationale that a particular shape is a design choice may be found in legal precedent: *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) (The court held that the configuration of the claimed disposable plastic nursing container was a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed container was significant.)

10. With respect to claim 7, Martucci teaches that the power supplying jack (18) and grounding jack (19) can take on a variety of forms that are non tubular shapes (Fig. 3, 8, 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide power and grounding jacks of Long as modified by Martucci of any known and conventional shape as exemplified by the variety of shapes used by Martucci.

11. With respect to claim 8, Martucci as modified by Long teaches that the grounding jack (19) has a grounding conductor (10) and no power supply terminal.

12. With respect to claim 9, Long teaches an AC/DC power supply adapter base unit (200) with a power cable (230) terminating in a power supplying jack (224'). Long does not disclose a second cable splitting off from the power cable. Martucci teaches a power supplying cable (1) with a grounding cable (4) splitting off from the power cable and terminating in a grounding jack (19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the AC/DC adapter of Long with the power cable and auxiliary grounding wire of Martucci to obtain an AC/DC adapter with a power supplying cable and jack providing a power supply path and first ground path,

and a grounding cable split from the power supplying cable and terminating in a grounding jack providing a second ground path other than the first.

13. With respect to claim 10, Long as modified by Martucci teaches of a power supplying jack (224') with a terminal (212') for supplying DC power and a tubular grounding conductor (214') coaxial with the terminal (Fig. 9).

14. With respect to claims 11 and 12, Long as modified by Martucci fails to disclose the grounding jack having a tubular grounding conductor and the same dimensions as power supplying jack. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a power and grounding jack as taught by Long modified by Martucci in any known size and shape that is known for use with plugs. The rationale that a particular shape is a design choice may be found in legal precedent: *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) (The court held that the configuration of the claimed disposable plastic nursing container was a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed container was significant.)

15. With respect to claim 13, Martucci teaches that the grounding jack (19) has a grounding conductor (10) and no power supply terminal.

16. With respect to claim 14, Martucci teaches that the power supplying jack (18) and grounding jack (19) can take on a variety of forms that are non tubular shapes (Fig. 3, 8, 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide power and grounding jacks of Long as modified by Martucci of any known and conventional shape as exemplified by the variety of shapes used by Martucci.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey M. Broussard whose telephone number is 571 272 2799. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmb


LYNN FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800